

Montana



opi.mt.gov

Denise Juneau, Superintendent
Montana Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501
www.opi.mt.gov

Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program

2015-2016 Competitive Grant Application

Due Date: June 15, 2015

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
Public Law 107-110
ESEA Title II, Part B

Table of Contents

I. Purpose of the MSP Program	3
II. Goals of Montana MSP Program	4
III. OPI MSP Grant Application Technical Assistance	5
IV. General Grant Information	6
Eligibility	6
Grant Awards: Number, Amount, and Duration	6
Funds Available	6
Use of Funds	6
Unallowable Expenditures	6
V. Program Requirements	7
Required Partners	7
Distribution of High-Need and Other LEAs	7
Required External Evaluator	7
Required Core Planning Team	7
Private School Participation	7
Reporting Requirements	8
VI. Application Process	8
Application Timeline: MSP Program Competitive Grants 2016-2018	8
Subsequent Opportunity to Apply	9
Instructions for Submission	9
VII. Requirements and Preparation of Application	10
Cover Page	10
Abstract	10
Partnership Operational Narrative	10
Partnership Evaluation and Accountability Plan	11
Scientifically Based Research	11
Partnership Budget and Budget Narrative	12
Proposal Appendices	12
Review Process	12
General Guidelines	12
Scoring	13
FFATA Reporting Requirements	14
Appendix A – 2015-2016 High-Need LEAs	15
Appendix B – Cover Sheet	16
Appendix C – Statement of Assurances	17
Appendix D – Partnership Identification Form	18
Appendix E – Budget Form	19
Appendix G – MSP Grant Application Review Rubric	20

I. PURPOSE OF THE MSP PROGRAM

In January 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) became law. ESEA Title II, Part B of this legislation authorizes the Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) competitive grant program. The purpose of this program is to improve the academic achievement of students in the areas of mathematics and science by encouraging state education agencies, institutions of postsecondary education, local education agencies, elementary schools, and secondary schools to participate in programs that improve instruction and upgrade the status and stature of mathematics and science teaching.

The MSP program is a formula grant program to the states, with the size of individual state awards based on student population and poverty rates. With these funds, each State is responsible for administering a competitive grant competition, in which grants are made to partnerships to improve teacher knowledge in mathematics and science. The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) is responsible for the administration of this program. ESEA Title I and ESEA Title II, Part A funds may be used to support the partnership's activities to demonstrate progress toward meeting the district partner's Title I Adequate Yearly Progress goals.

The Montana MSP Team is responsible for conducting this competitive grant program and will make awards to partnerships of high-need school districts and science, mathematics, and engineering departments within postsecondary education institutions. The overall goal is to give districts, and mathematics and science postsecondary education faculty, joint responsibility for improving mathematics and science instruction through the process of implementing high-quality professional learning.

The overall purpose of the ESEA Title II, Part B MSP program is to improve the academic achievement of students in the areas of mathematics and science by encouraging State educational agencies, postsecondary education institutions, local educational agencies (LEA), elementary schools and secondary schools to participate in programs that:

- improve and upgrade the status and stature of mathematics and science teaching by encouraging postsecondary education institutions to improve mathematics and science teacher education;
- focus on the education of mathematics and science teachers as a career-long process;
- bring mathematics and science teachers together with scientists, mathematicians, and engineers to improve their teaching skills;
- develop more rigorous mathematics and science curricula that are aligned with challenging state and local academic content standards and with the standards expected for postsecondary study in engineering, mathematics, and science; and
- improve and expand professional learning of mathematics and science teachers, including teaching such educators in the effective integration of technology into curricula and instruction.

II. GOALS OF MONTANA MSP PROGRAM

The OPI will award the 2015-2016 ESEA Title II, Part B MSP funding to multiple partnerships as outlined below. Awardees will improve K-12 math or science student learning and math and science teaching skills by implementing high-quality professional learning and collaborating with one another. These partnerships will:

GOAL 1: SUPPORT MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION IN MONTANA WITH A FOCUS ON GRADES 9 – 12.

- During the 2013 – 2015 grant cycle, the Standards-based Teaching Renewing Educators Across Montana (STREAM) grant program successfully provided services to support upper elementary and middle school math. The intent of this goal is to provide comparable services to all grades K – 12 with a focus on grades 9 - 12. This may include:
 - A guide program
 - Online modules
 - Summer workshops
 - School-based teams
 - A website
- A successful applicant for this goal will provide information in its narrative for how it will manage the transition from the work of the 2013 – 2015 STREAM grant to this grant cycle.
- For more information about the work of the 2013 – 2015 grant please contact the Montana MSP Team.

GOAL 2: EXPAND CERTIFICATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR UNCERTIFIED AND UNDER-CERTIFIED MATH AND SCIENCE TEACHERS IN RURAL SCHOOLS.

- In small schools across Montana, teachers are being asked to teach subjects beyond their areas of certification and expertise. The intent of this goal is to provide these teachers with the opportunities for certification that can be completed with minimal travel and cost. These programs may include:
 - Existing distance learning programs
 - New distance learning programs
 - Work with the certification and licensure divisions at the OPI
 - Work with the Board of Public Education
 - Use of grant budget to pay travel, tuition, fees and incentives.

GOAL 3: CREATE A SYSTEM THAT SUPPORTS COLLABORATION AMONG RURAL TEACHERS AND SCHOOLS.

- Best practices for professional learning include school based, collaborative programs. In small rural schools it can be challenging to develop and maintain these programs. The intent of this goal is to develop a system that can support this type of sustained high quality professional learning among groups of teachers in small rural schools. These programs may include:
 - Teacher Leaders/Mentors
 - PLCs or other collaborative group learning structures
 - Coverage of expenses through stipends and reimbursement to schools and/or teachers
 - Classroom observation by peers and/or mentors
 - Face-to-face and virtual meetings
 - Development and exchange of lessons and/or other resources
 - Communication via email tools such as listservs
 - Cohorts of schools with common PIR days
 - Funding for additional PIR days
 - Structured time for collaboration within or outside of the school day

It is the intent of the Montana MSP Program to fund projects that are strongly aligned to best practices in professional development. For more information about how Montana defines Professional Development or research on best practices see:

<http://www.mtrules.org/gateway/RuleNo.asp?RN=10%2E55%2E714>
<http://learningforward.org/standards/#.VSgOP005C70>

III. OPI MSP GRANT APPLICATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

An informational recording about the MSP grants and application process can be found on the OPI MSP page.

View the MSP Overview Video at <http://youtu.be/4HuDI0NnBfo> and see frequently asked questions and solutions at:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WbV_8GtNzsC6SFyEpO7NM8IrEmeAu5MQIAclZVrkvLk/edit?usp=sharing.

For information and additional technical assistance email mssp@mt.gov, your email will automatically be sent to all members of the Montana MSP Team:

Jael Prezeau, Content Standards and Instruction Director
Office of Public Instruction
Telephone: (406)444-3128

Jake Warner, Mathematics Curriculum Specialist
Office of Public Instruction
Telephone: (406) 444-0706

Chris DeWald, Science Curriculum Specialist
Office of Public Instruction
Telephone: (406) 444-3557

Tara Steinke, Data Assistant
Office of Public Instruction
Telephone: (406) 444-3538

Live question and answer sessions will be held at 2 pm on May 7th and June 4th via Microsoft Lync. To access these question and answer sessions, use the following link and call in number:

→ [Join Lync Meeting](#)

Join by phone

[406-444-4647](tel:406-444-4647) (Helena Capitol Campus Region) English (United States)

[Find a local number](#)

Conference ID: 747349

[Help](#)

Connectivity and audio can be hit or miss, some users might have to use the link for visual and the phone number for audio connections.

IV. GENERAL GRANT INFORMATION

ELIGIBILITY: Who may apply? Partnerships of high-need local education agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary education institutions may apply.

See program requirements for required partners.

The Montana MSP definition of a “high-need school district” is an LEA where 20% or more of the children that they serve are from families with incomes below the poverty line according to census data AND that has 50% or more of tested students achieving below proficient on the most recent available math and/or science state test, OR has 20 or fewer enrolled students. The list of eligible high-need LEA partners for the 2015 – 2016 MSP grant cycle is listed in Appendix A.

GRANT AWARDS: NUMBER, AMOUNT, AND DURATION: For the 2015 – 2016 year, the OPI will award multiple grants. At the end of the 2015 – 2016 year, these grants will be eligible to reapply for funding for the remainder of the grant cycle (2016 – 2018) contingent on the availability of federal funding.

The Montana MSP Team anticipates receiving approximately \$680,000 for the 2015 – 2016 grant year. The actual number and value of the grants awarded will be determined based on the proposals received. The Montana MSP Team anticipates awarding the following number and value of grants for this cycle:

- Goal One: one (1) grant between \$150,000 and \$250,000
- Goal Two: two to four (2-4) grants between \$20,000 and \$80,000
- Goal Three: two to four (2-4) grants between \$50,000 and \$100,000

The number of grants funded and the funding levels may be adjusted for reapplication after the 2015 – 2016 year.

FUNDS AVAILABLE

Grant funds will be available as soon after July 1, 2015 as possible. Grant fund availability is contingent on availability of federal funds.

USE OF FUNDS

Funds received shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds that would otherwise be used for proposed activities. Follow EDGAR requirements.

Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR):

EDGAR sections 74, 76, 77, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 98, 99 apply to this program

www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.pdf

UNALLOWABLE EXPENDITURES

- Food, beverage, entertainment
- Land or building acquisition
- Permanent technology equipment (i.e., digital or video cameras, computers or tablets, mobile devices, network systems)
- Property or furniture for office use
- Construction costs or costs for renovating and remodeling
- Pre-award costs or costs associated with writing the application

If you have questions about allowable and unallowable expenses, please email the Montana MSP Team at mssp@mt.gov.

V. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

REQUIRED PARTNERS

To be eligible, a partnership must include, at a minimum:

1. a high-need local educational agency (LEA), as defined in Section IV. General Grant Information, Eligibility;
2. an engineering, technology, mathematics, or science department of a postsecondary education institution, which may be a department in a 4-year university, 2-year technical college, tribal college, or community college; and

A partnership may include:

- a teacher education department of a postsecondary institution
- another science, technology, engineering or mathematics or teacher education department of a postsecondary institution;
- additional LEAs, public or private elementary schools or secondary schools, or a consortium of such schools (see note about distribution of high-need and other LEAs);
- a business; and/or
- a nonprofit or for-profit organization of demonstrated effectiveness in improving the quality of mathematics and science teachers.

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH-NEED AND OTHER LEAS

Each partnership is required to have at minimum one high-need LEA. In addition to this, all programs must have at a minimum 50% of the teachers, schools, and districts benefitting from their program from a high need entity. Specifically, projects need to ensure that when they identify a partner as a high-need LEA, the individual participants from that LEA come from a high-needs school within the LEA and that 50% or more of the individual teachers who participate in program events and element are from high-need LEAs and schools.

REQUIRED EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

A qualified external project evaluator shall be used by each MSP grant recipient to design, implement, and manage an evaluation and accountability system that includes rigorous objectives used to measure the formative and summative impact of the project. The external project evaluator will work in collaboration with the MSP partnership to determine the common expected outcomes and measurement indicators for the project and in accordance with federal and state guidelines. Projects should plan to spend approximately 10% of their total budget on their external evaluator.

REQUIRED CORE PLANNING TEAM

All projects shall have a core planning team in place to oversee the general design and implementation of the project. At a minimum the team will consist of:

1. a teacher from one or more of the high-need partner LEAs;
2. a building principal or district superintendent from one of the high-need partner LEAs;
3. a science or math education faculty member; and
4. the project evaluator.

PRIVATE SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

Funds awarded through these sub grants are subject to the requirements of Section 14503 of ESEA Pub.L. 108-382 (Participation by Private School Children and Teachers) and the regulations in 34 CFR 299, Subpart E. The statute and regulations require that sub grantees provide private schools in their area the opportunity for meaningful collaboration with the sub grantees during the planning process for any subsequent professional development activities. Further, the sub grantees must provide private school children and their teachers, or other educational personnel, the opportunity to receive services and benefits of the program on an equitable basis with public school children and teachers.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The U.S. Department of Education and the Montana Office of Public Instruction require:

1. All partnerships to complete the online Annual Performance Report (APR) <http://apr.ed-msp.net/users/login>, providing project information and reporting the partnership's progress in meeting the objectives described in the evaluation and accountability plan. These objectives must include measures of student and teacher content knowledge and skills in mathematics and/or science.
3. The Montana MSP Team may administer a state level APR each year to monitor progress towards specific state-level goals as outlined in the RFP and the grant proposals.
4. All partnerships will be required to participate in the budget reporting processes determined appropriate by the OPI Centralized Services.
5. The Montana MSP Team will monitor all projects on an ongoing basis to ensure compliance with all requirements.

VI. APPLICATION PROCESS

Montana Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) – All eligible entities may submit an application for grant funding based upon availability of federal funding, satisfactory and timely reports, and meeting grant requirements.

APPLICATION TIMELINE: MSP PROGRAM COMPETITIVE GRANTS 2016-2018

2015 Application Timeline	
April 17	Competitive Grant Application posted on the OPI web site and announced via the OPI official e-mail
June 15	Applications shall be postmarked and received electronically by 5:00 p.m. *No facsimile grant applications will be accepted.
June 16-30	Application review process
July 1	Grant awards announced
July 1	Project funds become available
July 1	Comments provided to non-funded grant applications
September	Mandatory meeting for MSP Project Directors and External Evaluators

SUBSEQUENT OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY

The Montana MSP Team is committed to the competitive process required by this program. Awards will be made for high-quality proposals that describe programs that attend to all competition requirements. There is no obligation on the part of the OPI to award all the available funds in this round of competition.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION

Mail the completed original Montana MSP Grant application and two (2) copies to: Office of Public Instruction, ATTN: Tara Steinke, Data Assistant, PO Box 202501, Helena, MT 59620-2501, postmarked no later than June 15, 2015;

and

By 5:00 p.m. June 15, 2015, submit an electronic PDF copy of the completed grant application to:

Tara Steinke, Data Assistant

Office of Public Instruction

E-Mail: msp@mt.gov

Faxed applications will not be accepted.

VII. REQUIREMENTS AND PREPARATION OF APPLICATION

COVER PAGE – Use the form provided in Appendix A of the RFP. The cover page is the first page of the application.

ABSTRACT – Provide a 200 to 300 word abstract of the proposal that briefly and concisely describes the program to be implemented and summarizes the intended results of the program.

PARTNERSHIP OPERATIONAL NARRATIVE – The partnership narrative shall address each of the following items. Applications shall keep the narrative to no more than 25 pages, use half inch or larger margins, use Times New Roman, 12 point font, be double spaced and include no more than 30 lines of type per page.

- a. Partnerships – The partnership narrative will summarize the makeup of the partnership and how the partnership operates.
- b. Research Base – The partnership narrative will discuss and cite the current state of knowledge relevant to the proposed program. This brief literature review should clearly indicate why the proposed activities were selected or designed.
- c. Needs Assessment – A partnership narrative will reflect data to address professional development needs, goals, and activities of the proposal.
- d. Project Plan – The partnership narrative will clearly describe the goals and objectives for the program and a detailed summary of the responsibility of each partner. The narrative will include time frame, resources, responsible persons and evaluation components. In addition, provide descriptions of the number, type, duration and scope of planned professional development work, including the number of teachers engaged. (A table format is suggested for laying out this information.)
- e. Alignment to College and Career Ready (CCR) Standards for Math and/or Science – The partnership narrative will clearly explain the tie between professional development and the CCR standards.
- f. Coordination with Other Existing Programs and Initiatives – The partnership narrative will clearly explain how the project is coordinating with other improvement efforts and projects in the respective schools, districts, regions, and state.
- g. Management/Capability – The partnership narrative will clearly demonstrate that the partnership has the capability of managing the program, organizing the work, and meeting deadlines.
- h. Communication and Interaction – The partnership narrative will clearly describe how the project uses a K-12 systems approach to provide ongoing communication and interaction between the participants, faculty and partners.
- i. Leadership Involvement – The partnership narrative will clearly indicate how the project fosters commitment of school and district leadership.
- j. Implementation and Sustainability of Professional Development – A partnership narrative will clearly describe how the project plans to ensure support for implementation and sustainability.

PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN – The partnership narrative shall address each of the following items. Applications shall keep the evaluation and accountability plan narrative to no more than eight pages, use half inch or larger margins, use Times New Roman, 12 point font, be double spaced and include no more than 30 lines of type per page.

The partnership evaluation and accountability plan will:

- a. describe how the effectiveness of the partnership itself will be assessed;
- b. describe how it will evaluate the overall success of the project (summative). In general, the partnership plan will explain how it will determine whether the partnership activities have increased administrator and K-12 teacher knowledge and skills in science or mathematics. The plan will also include measurable objectives to increase the number of district administrators participating in the professional development activities;
- c. include a discussion of the feasibility of incorporating an experimental design with random assignment to treatment and control groups, matched comparison groups **or** non-matched comparison groups as the central part of their evaluation design framework. If none of the three options are feasible, the narrative should summarize why each was not;
- d. describe how it will measure progress toward meeting its objectives (formative). Mid-term and annual reports on progress related to this outcome will be reviewed by the project evaluator and provided to the Montana MSP Team;
- e. strongly align to the best practices in professional development as defined on page 4; and
- f. describe how the results of various formative and summative evaluations will be disseminated to the partnership, and to other possible venues, including method and time line for dissemination.

SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH

The term “scientifically based research” means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs. Proposals that demonstrate a design that meets the criteria for scientifically based research will receive a 5 point bonus. For the purposes of this bonus, scientifically based research includes research that:

1. employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment and involve rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
2. relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;
3. is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions, with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest and with a preference for random-assignment experiments or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;
4. ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
5. has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective and scientific review.

Proposals that believe they are eligible for this bonus should indicate this in their evaluation and accountability plan. And check the appropriate box on their Cover Sheet (Appendix B).

PARTNERSHIP BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE

The budget narrative will be clearly tied to the plan summarized in the Partnership Operational Narrative. The budget narrative will describe the basis for determining the amounts shown on the overall project budget page and for each of the partner funding request pages submitted (Appendix E). The partnership will determine the necessary resources to support participation in state MSP and STEM conferences, forums and workshops, as well as travel to Annual MSP Conference sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

The budget narrative must clearly state which partner will act as fiscal agent for this grant. Partnerships that use an LEA as their fiscal agent will receive a 5 point bonus.

PROPOSAL APPENDICES

The grant application appendices should include only the following documents. These appendices are not included in the application page limit.

- a. Cover Page
- b. Statement of Assurances (prime applicants other than school districts shall contact the Montana MSP Team for proper common assurance forms required for submission with the proposal)
- c. Partnership Identification Forms
- d. Budget Forms
- e. Letter of Commitment from each partner
- f. Partner Funding Request for each partner

REVIEW PROCESS

The application review process includes: (1) proposals scored by an external review by a panel experienced in reading similar grant applications; (2) recommendations made to the Montana MSP Team by the external review panel; and (3) final decisions made by the Montana MSP Team based on the external panel recommendations and required policy decisions regarding the award.

Successful grant applicants will be notified by July 1, 2015 of grants awards. Decisions of the Montana MSP Team on funding and awarding of grants shall be final.

Application Scoring: ***Appendix F*** provides the basic rubric used in the review process. Along with the numerical score, each reviewer will list the strengths and weaknesses of the responses to each part. A proposal accepted for funding may require project and budget revisions before final approval and funding is released.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

As proposals are received at the OPI, they will be reviewed by the Montana MSP Team for completeness and compliance with the requirements set forth in ESEA Title II, Part B of NCLB to determine applicant eligibility. Any questions about significant omissions from a proposal or about applicant eligibility will be referred to the proposing organization. If, in the judgment of the Montana MSP Team, a proposal is late, significantly incomplete, or an applicant cannot establish its eligibility, the proposal will be omitted from consideration. The decision of the Montana MSP Team is final. Applicants submitting proposals that are withdrawn due to incompleteness or ineligibility will be notified in writing.

A review panel will evaluate eligible applications on the basis of the required application components and the established criteria. The review panel will assess each eligible application and make recommendations to the Montana MSP Team in the areas of program, budget, and efficacy. The review panel's scores and recommendations will be the primary determinant of successful proposals and will form the basis for negotiation and final selection. Following the review, the Montana MSP Team will contact eligible project directors to discuss any modifications of the project plan that may be required. The Montana MSP Team will seek to fund those proposals that show the most promise for successful professional development programs.

SCORING

The panel of reviewers will assess each plan. Each aspect or part of the plan will be worth a set number of points (see chart below). Individual panel members will evaluate each aspect and assign points up to the maximum for each aspect. They will be asked to list strengths and weaknesses for each aspect as well. Finally, the Montana MSP Team will review the scored applications, add in bonus points earned, total the scores, and then make necessary policy decisions regarding the successful awards to grantees.

Proposal Aspect See Appendix F (page 20)	Maximum Points
Overall Design and Efficacy of Project Plan	25
Makeup, Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	15
Quality/Level of Implementation and Sustainability Support for the Participants	20
Quality of Evaluation and Accountability Plan	25
Budget and Cost Effectiveness	15
Total Points	100
Research Bonus	5
Fiscal Partner Bonus	5
Possible Points (Including Bonus)	110

FFATA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) was signed on September 26, 2006. The intent is to empower every American with the ability to hold the government accountable for each spending decision. The end result is to reduce wasteful spending in the government. As of October 1, 2010, new reporting requirements were issued requiring recipients of federal grants and contracts to comply with sub recipient reporting requirements under the FFATA (Pub. L. 109-282). Awardees (in this case the state) receiving new awards of \$25,000 or more will report on newly issued sub grants (your programs). The information reported will be made available to the public at USASpending.gov. The following data must be reported by the prime awardee (the state) under FFATA:

- name of the entity receiving the award;
- amount of the award;
- information on the award including transaction type, funding agency, program source, award title and Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number;
- location of the entity receiving the award and primary location of the performance under the award, including city, state, congressional district and country;
- DUNS number of the entity receiving the award or the parent entity of the recipient; *and*,

When applicable (this will not apply to most MSP sub grantees)

- names and total compensation of the five highest compensated officers of the entity if, during the preceding fiscal year, it received: (a) 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues in federal awards, and (b) \$25 million or more in annual gross revenues from federal awards; or if the public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executive through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

The state will report sub award information using the FFATA Sub Award Reporting System (<http://www.fsrs.gov>). The state must report information related to the sub award by the end of the month following the month that the sub award or obligation was made (e.g., if the prime awardee made the sub award between March 1 and March 31, 2011, it must submit sub award information by April 30, 2011).

When applicable the prime awardee must submit its own executive compensation data, as well as the executive compensation data of its sub awardees, in the same manner.

In order to better assist the OPI with this requirement it is *encouraged* that all sub grantees register with the Central Contractor Registration System (CCR). Those sub grantees who register with the CCR (<http://ccr.gov>) will have their information pre-populated into the FFATA Sub Award Reporting System (FSRS), reducing the burden for collecting and disseminating the required data within the timeline outlined above. The OPI appreciates your support in this matter.

**Appendix A – Montana MSP High-
Need LEA List 2015-2016**

Alzada Elementary	Frazer Elementary	Plenty Coups High School
Arlee Elementary	Frazer High School	Polaris Elementary
Ashland Elementary	Froid High School	Polson High School
Avon Elementary	Galata Elementary	Poplar Elementary
Ayers Elementary	Garrison Elementary	Poplar High School
Basin Elementary	Geraldine K-12	Pryor Elementary
Bear Paw Elementary	Gildford Colony Elementary	Reichle Elementary
Belfry K-12 Schools	Gold Creek Elementary	Rocky Boy Elementary
Birney Elementary	Grant Elementary	Ronan High School
Box Elder Elementary	Grass Range High School	Rosebud K-12
Box Elder High School	Hardin Elementary	Ross Elementary
Brockton Elementary	Hardin High School	Roundup High School
Brockton High School	Harlem Elementary	S H Elementary
Brorson Elementary	Harlem High School	S Y Elementary
Browning Elementary	Hawks Home Elementary	Saco Elementary
Browning High School	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schools	Saco High School
Butte High School	Heart Butte K-12 Schools	Savage High School
Carter County High School	Helmville Elementary	Shawmut Elementary
Carter Elementary	Judith Gap Elementary	Sheridan High School
Charlo High School	Kester Elementary	SouthHigh School
Cleveland Elementary	Lame Deer Elementary	Spring Creek Colony Elementary
Cooke City Elementary	Lame Deer High School	Spring Creek Elementary
Custer K-12 Schools	Lodge Grass Elementary	Spring Creek Elementary
Cut Bank High School	Lodge Grass High School	Thompson Falls High School
Davey Elementary	McCormick Elementary	Troy High School
Deerfield Elementary	Melrose Elementary	Turner High School
Divide Elementary	Melstone Elementary	Valier High School
Dixon Elementary	Miami Elementary	Victor K-12 Schools
Drummond High School	Moore Elementary	Wisdom Elementary
Dupuyer Elementary	Morin Elementary	Wolf Point Elementary
Dutton/Brady K-12 Schools	Mountain View Elementary	Wolf Point High School
East Glacier Park Elementary	North Harlem Colony Elementary	Wyola Elementary
Elliston Elementary	Olney-Bissell Elementary	Yaak Elementary
Fishtail Elementary	Ovando Elementary	

MONTANA MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP (MSP) PROGRAM
APPLICATION

Applying Institution or Organization: _____

Program Title: _____

Program Director

Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP Code: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

E-Mail: _____

Amount of MSP Funds Requested: \$ _____

Number of Teachers to be Served Directly: _____

Applicant believes application qualifies for:

- ☐ Research Bonus
☐ Fiscal Agent Bonus

Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:

The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.

Typed or Printed Name of Authorized
Official Grants Officer or
Superintendent of Fiscal Agent

Title

Signature of Authorized Official

Date

Appendix C – Statement of Assurances

Montana Office of Public Instruction

ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program

STATEMENT OF ESEA TITLE II, PART B ASSURANCES

Should an award of funds from the Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program be made to the applicant in support of the activities proposed in this application, the authorized signature on the cover page of this application certifies to the OPI that the authorized official will:

1. Upon request, provide the Montana Office of Public Instruction with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and regulations.
2. Conduct educational activities funded by this project in compliance with the following federal laws:
 - a. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;
 - b. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972;
 - c. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;
 - d. Age Discrimination Act of 1975;
 - e. Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; and
 - f. Improving America's Schools Act of 1994.
3. Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources.
4. Take into account during the development of programming the need for greater access to and participation in the targeted disciplines by students from historically underrepresented and underserved groups.
5. Submit, in accordance with stated guidelines and deadlines, all program and evaluation reports required by the U.S. Department of Education and the Montana Office of Public Instruction.
6. The applicant will retain records of the program for five years and will allow access to those records for purposes of review and audit.

Signature Information for Appendix A Cover Page with School Districts as Prime Applicant: The Board of Trustees submitted a Common Assurances form to the Office of Public Instruction for the 2011-12 school year, and no circumstances affecting the validity of the assurances have changed since its submittal. Further, the Board of Trustees has certified that the Common Assurances for Federal Programs are accepted as the basic conditions for local participation and assistance in operation of this Title II Part B MSP.

**Appendix D – Partnership Identification
Form**

Montana Office of Public Instruction

ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program

PARTNERSHIP IDENTIFICATION FORM

Include a Partnership Identification Form for each of the partner institutions/organizations.

PARTNER INSTITUTION: _____

Contact Name/Title: _____

Contact Mailing Address: _____

Telephone: _____

Fax: _____

E-Mail: _____

Type of Institution/Organization: _____

Partner School District Demographics (If Applicable):

<p align="center">Appendix E – Budget Form</p>

Montana Office of Public Instruction

ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program

**Budget
Partnership Funding Request**

Program Title:

Direct Cost Requested for Partner	TOTAL
1. Salaries & Wages (Professional and Clerical)	
2. Employee Benefits	
3. Travel in State	
4. Travel Out of State	
5. Materials and Supplies	
6. Consultants and Contracts	
7. Teacher Stipends	
8. Equipment (Purchase)	
9. Other (Equipment Rental, Printing, etc.)	
Indirect Costs* (if appropriate)	
Total Budget	
OPI Use Only: Approved By/Date	

*The indirect cost rate shall not exceed the indirect cost rate for the partner with the lowest indirect cost rate.

This form is a required element of the grant application. Justification for each of the categories shall be included in the budget narrative portion of the application. For reporting, an itemized breakdown of these budget categories and a budget narrative explaining how each line item was calculated and the actual total project cost share must be included.

Appendix F – Grant Application Review Rubric

Montana Office of Public Instruction

ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program

OVERALL DESIGN AND EFFICACY OF PROJECT PLAN

0 – 2 Points	3 - 5 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is not a complete description of how the project will address all the program goals and grant requirements as outlined in Sections II Goals of Montana MSP Grant Program and VII Requirements and Preparation of Application 2) There is not a complete description of the research base for the project components 3) There is not a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools and districts 4) There is not a complete description of the ongoing goal of increasing educators' understanding of the critical role of college and career readiness standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction and professional development 5) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were not addressed 6) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is low 	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is a complete description of how the project will address all program goals and grant requirements as outlined in Sections II Goals of Montana MSP Grant Program and VII Requirements and Preparation of Application 2) There is a complete description of the research base for the project components 3) There is a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools and districts 4) There is a complete description of the ongoing goal of increasing educators' understanding of the critical role of career and college readiness standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction and professional development 5) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were adequately addressed 6) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is moderate to high

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (5X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

PARTNERSHIP

0 – 2 Points	3 - 5 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is not a complete description of the partnership including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. list of all partners b. how the partnership will operate and evidence of ongoing collaboration to support the implementation of the partnership to reach its goals c. how the duties and responsibilities will be shared between the partners d. how the partnership will foster communication and interaction of the partners 2) There is little or no evidence that the partnership has sufficient capacity to organize and manage the project 3) There is no evidence that the required core planning team will regularly assemble 4) There is not a complete description of how the effectiveness of the partnership will be assessed during the operation time frame 	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is a complete description of the partnership including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. list of all partners b. how the partnership will operate and evidence of ongoing collaboration to support the implementation of the partnership to reach its goals c. how the duties and responsibilities will be shared between the partners d. how the partnership will foster communication and interaction of the partners 2) There is evidence that the partnership has sufficient capacity to organize and manage the project 3) There is evidence that the required core planning team will regularly assemble 4) There is a complete description of how the effectiveness of the partnership will be assessed both during the development and operation time frame

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT AND SUSTAINABILITY FOR PARTICIPANTS

0 – 2 Points	3 - 5 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is not a complete description of how the project will provide implementation and sustainability support for the school and district participants through professional development including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. how time will be provided for ongoing study, practice, and practice with feedback b. how the project will work with teachers to adapt applicable district science or mathematics instructional strategies to increase K-12 student learning in mathematics or science c. how the project will facilitate targeted professional development for teachers who need more intensive or in-depth assistance through the use of regionally based job-embedded professional development delivered through a variety of venues including distance learning d. how the project will ensure the meaningful engagement of schools and districts e. how the project will provide the teachers and administrators with professional development skills to assist other educators, in their school, district, or region, on the implementation of the common standards for math or science <p>2) There is not a description of how continued support for the participants might occur beyond the life of the grant</p>	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is a complete description of how the project will provide implementation and sustainability support for the school and district participants through professional development including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. how time will be provided for ongoing study, practice, and practice with feedback b. how the project will work with teachers to adapt applicable district science or mathematics instructional strategies to increase K-12 student learning in mathematics or science c. how the project will facilitate targeted professional development for teachers who need more intensive or in-depth assistance through the use of regionally based job-embedded professional development delivered through a variety of venues including distance learning d. how the project will ensure the meaningful engagement of schools and districts e. how the project will provide the teachers and administrators with professional development skills to assist other educators, in their school, district, or region, on the implementation of the common standards for math or science <p>2) There is a description of how continued support for the participants might occur beyond the life of the grant</p>

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (4X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

0 – 2 Points	3 - 5 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is not a complete description of how the project will ensure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) by increasing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. active engagement of district administrators and K-12 educators b. math or science common standards content knowledge professional development c. operation of the project delivery system – regional and school based workshops, distance learning and materials development <p>2) A research based PD model was not addressed or did not align with ARM 10.55.714 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>3) There is not a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts</p> <p>4) There is not a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies</p>	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is a complete description of how the project will ensure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) by increasing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. active engagement of district administrators and K-12 educators b. math or science common standards content knowledge professional development c. operation of the project delivery system – regional and school based workshops, distance learning and materials development <p>2) A research based PD model was addressed which aligned with ARM 10.55.714 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>3) There is a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts</p> <p>4) There is a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies</p>

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (5X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS

0 – 2 Points	3 - 5 Points
Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:	Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:
1) There is not a complete description outlining the basis for determining the amounts shown on the budget	1) There is a complete description outlining the basis for determining the amounts shown on the budget
2) The budget is not in alignment with the activities described in the various parts of the grant proposal narrative	2) The budget is aligned with the activities described in the various parts of the grant proposal narrative
3) The amount assigned to a given portion of the budget seems either excessive or insufficient given the goals of the project	3) The amount assigned to each portion of the budget is sufficient given the goals of the project
4) All the required budget forms were not included	4) All the required budget forms were included and complete

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____